

Amendments to the Drawings:

The drawings were objected to under 37 CFR 1.83(a) because the drive motor connected to the first housing part and the handle connected to the second housing part were not shown. Accordingly, applicants present a replacement sheet of drawing of FIG. 24 wherein the drive motor and the handle are represented in schematic or black box form. Thus, as set forth in the disclosure on page 6, line 28, the first housing part 81 can, for example, be connected to the drive motor 82 of the work apparatus while the second housing part 83 can be connected to a handle 84 of the work apparatus. FIG. 24 of the replacement drawing sheet should now be in compliance with 37 CFR 1.83(a) and the Examiner's approval thereof is respectfully requested.

Attachment: Replacement Sheet  
Annotated Sheet Showing Changes

Remarks

Claims 20 and 22 are amended and claim 23 is added.  
Claims 2 to 10, 12 to 16 and 20 to 23 are pending in this application of which only claim 20 is in independent form.

Claim 23 is added to provide another definition of the applicants' invention and the antecedent basis therefor is on page 6, lines 2 to 7, taken together with FIG. 3.

Independent claim 20 was rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Clarke et al in view of Zimmermann et al. The following will show that claim 20, as amended, patentably distinguishes the applicants' invention over this combination of references.

In the action, the view is expressed that Clarke et al shows a coil spring whose end section is fixed in a guide slot. Applicants respectfully submit that the end section of Clarke et al is not fixed in the guide slot.

In applicants' claim 20, the end section 7 of the coil spring 2 is disposed form tight in the helically-shaped guide slot 9 of the guide body 3. Applicants' claim 20 requires that the end section of the coil spring is guided in the helically-shaped slot and that the end section is fixed to the helically-shaped slot so that the coil spring is fixed to the housing part via the slot. This is set forth in applicants' claim 20 with the clauses:

"said end section (7) and said transition section (11) being guided in said helically-shaped guide slot (9);

said end section (7) being fixed in said helically-shaped guide slot so that said coil spring is fixed to said first housing part via said helically-shaped guide slot;" (emphasis and parenthetical numerals added)

The above-quoted features and limitations are nowhere suggested in Clarke et al.

The single figure of Clarke et al shows a coil spring having a flattened end. The rubber element 11 is loosely placed in the coil spring. In the single figure of Clarke et al, nowhere is the rubber element 11 in contact engagement with the coil spring. At column 1, lines 61 to 62, and column 2, lines 1 and 2, we are told that the rubber element need possibly be fixed in the coil spring. For this purpose, in the third paragraph of column 2, we are advised that the rubber element can be mounted on the coil spring. However, nowhere is there any suggestion of fixing an end section of the coil spring to a housing part via the helically-shaped slot of the guide.

For an antivibration element in a portable handheld apparatus, it is essential that forces in the longitudinal direction of the coil spring as well as forces transverse to the longitudinal direction of the coil spring can be transmitted. The coil spring must be tightly and fixedly held at its ends in order to make a transmission of transverse forces possible.

In Exhibit A submitted with this amendment, a coil spring is shown on which the rubber element of Clarke et al is mounted. Exhibit A shows a coil spring which is tightly clamped at its ends and which is loaded in a direction transverse to its longitudinal direction. As Exhibit A shows, the rubber element

of Clarke et al moves into a transverse position together with the coil spring because of the loose arrangement of the rubber element in the coil spring. A contact engagement of the turns of the coil spring on the base of the slot in radial direction does not take place here.

The feature of claim 20 according to which the turns of the transition section of the coil spring come into contact with the slot for a deformation of the coil spring under load in a direction perpendicular to the longitudinal axis of the coil spring is not realized in Clarke et al. In Clarke et al, the rubber element tilts within the coil spring so that the turns do not come into contact. In the applicants' invention, a contact in the transition section is achieved because the end section of the coil spring is fixed on the slot and the end section is fixed to the housing part via the slot. For this reason, the slot cannot move relative to the housing part. For a loading of the coil spring, the coil spring moves relative to the housing part and relative to the slot as can be seen in applicants' FIGS. 4 and 6, for example. In this way, a contact of the coil spring against the slot is achieved.

In this connection, applicants note that also in Newman, no contact of the coil spring in radial direction takes place. In this reference, there is only one contact in the axial direction.

On page 4, lines 4 and 5, of the action, reference is made to a third play in axial direction. This contradicts the wording of applicants' claim 20. In contrast to the first play and to the second play, the third play is not in the axial direction but in the radial direction of the coil spring. Applicants

respectfully call the Examiner's attention to this fact as it is most significant in the applicants' invention that the third play is in the radial direction.

With respect to claim 22, reference is made in the action to the modified figure of Clarke et al shown on page 5 of the action. Attention is called to the fact that in the region marked by the Examiner entitled "increased play with increased distance from end section", it is not possible for the turns of the coil spring to come into contact with the base of the helically-shaped slot. This is shown in Exhibit B attached to this amendment which shows the coil spring of Clarke et al. The circle marked 100 and the circle marked 102 indicate the position of a turn of the coil spring when in contact with the base of the helically-shaped slot and on the lower and upper flanks, respectively. As shown in Exhibit B, the turn of the coil spring in both cases lies in the center region of the base which the Examiner assigned the first play b in the drawing of page 5 of the action. In that region, in which the greater play is drawn in by the Examiner, the coil spring cannot come into contact. The region identified as "end section" is also arbitrarily shown in the drawing because a fixing of the coil spring on the slot is not provided in Clarke et al and the coil spring in the figure of Clarke et al modified by the Examiner is continued beyond the region of the section to which the Examiner added the legend "end section".

In Clarke et al, the play is constant over the entire length of the rubber element in radial direction, that is, that region which permits a free movement of the coil spring relative to the

rubber element in radial direction until the coil spring lies against the base of the slot. Clarke et al does not show any increase of the radial play. Accordingly, claim 22 should therefore be allowable because this claim includes the feature and limitation of:

"...said third play (b) between said coil spring and said base becomes greater with increasing distance from said end section when said antivibration unit is not under load; in a first cross section of said coil spring in said transition section, said coil spring is at a first play distance from said base; said first play distance increases to a second greater distance (b') in the course of a half turn of said coil spring so that with increasing load and the deformation of said coil spring associated therewith more turns of said coil spring come at least in part into contact engagement with said helically-shaped guide slot thereby increasing said spring stiffness." (emphasis added)

An increase of radial play is not shown or suggested in Clarke et al so that claim 22 should be allowable.

Claim 23 is dependent from claim 22 and is concerned with line 23 in FIG. 3 which is drawn through the base of the slot at successive turns of the slot in the transition section 11. This line runs toward the center of the coil spring on an imaginary conical surface. The slot becomes deeper with increasing distance from the end section 7.

This too is nowhere suggested in any of the applied references so that claim 23 should likewise now be allowable.

For the reasons advanced above, applicants submit that claim 20 should now patentably distinguish the applicants' invention over the applied references and be allowable. The

remaining claims 2 to 10, 12 to 16 and 21 to 23 are all dependent from claim 20 so that they too should now be allowable.

Reconsideration of the application is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,



Walter Ottesen  
Reg. No. 25,544

Walter Ottesen  
Patent Attorney  
P.O. Box 4026  
Gaithersburg, Maryland 20885-4026

Phone: (301) 869-8950

Date: November 13, 2006